REMARKS

All claims are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102 over Dammann. That rejection is respectfully traversed.

The resin composition of the present invention is a liquid which is curable by, for example, ultraviolet radiation. The resin composition is a Michael addition reaction product of a Michael addition a vinyl group containing compound reactant, multifunctional acrylic ester reactant, and β-dicarbonyl group containing compound or resin reactant in which the β-dicarbonyl group has two activated hydrogen atoms in its methylene position. The three Michael addition reactants are employed such that the equivalent ratio of the vinyl group of the vinyl group containing compound to the activated hydrogen atom is in the range of 0.01:1 to 0.9:1, and the equivalent ratio of all unsaturated groups in the vinyl group containing compound and multifunctional acrylic ester to the activated hydrogen is greater than 1.05:1.

The Dammann patent relates to an improvement in several prior patents. It teaches a composition containing a Michael addition reaction product of a Michael donor and Michael acceptor, formed in the presence of a new catalyst system comprising an epoxide moiety and a quaternary salt. Dammann teaches that the epoxide moiety material can be glycidyl methacrylate ("GMA"). It is further taught at lines 30 et seq., that the epoxy moiety-containing material can be added separately to the reaction mixture and will react to act to form the catalyst with the quaternary salt *in situ*.

A catalyst, by definition, is a material which accelerates the reaction taking place between the reactants without entering into the reaction itself. Therefore, any GMA in the catalyst cannot become a part of the Michael product. The Final Rejection appears to accept this fact, but presents new calculations designed to show that under some circumstances free GMA may be present in the reaction mixture. The rejection is then premised on the assumption that any excess glycidyl methacrylate is a Michael reaction reactant and will become a part of Dammann's product. While the Final Rejection asserts that GMA is a Michael acceptor, it cites no authority for that assertion. There is no basis for this naked assertion in the text of Dammann or elsewhere in the record. Accordingly, no *prima facie* rejection has been made.

Dammann teaches that a Michael addition product is the result of reacting a Michael acceptor with a Michael donor. The patent states that these acceptors are multiacrylates at column 2, lines 65 et seq. No methacrylates, multi or otherwise, and particularly not GMA, are described as Michael reactants, although one methacrylate monomer is taught to be useful as an inert solvent (column 7, lines 44-46). Dammann's description of Michael donors (column 5, line 16 et seq.) likewise does not include any methacrylates. Neither the other references nor the present specification teaches GMA is a Michael reactant.

The claims of this application recite a Michael addition reaction product of three components, one of which is the vinyl-containing compound. As apparent from this language, and as more particularly stated on page 9, these vinyl-containing compounds are those capable of entering into the Michael addition reaction. Nothing of record teaches GMA is capable of entering into the Michael addition reaction.

In light of this failure to advance a *pima facie* rejection, no consideration of any of the other assertions about Dammann which are made in the Office Action is necessary.

In view of the above amendment and remarks, applicant believes the pending application is in condition for allowance.

Dated: January 24, 2011

Respectfully submitted,

/Edward A. Meilman/

By_____

Edward A. Meilman
Registration No.: 24,735
DICKSTEIN SHAPIRO LLP
1633 Broadway
New York, New York 10019-6708
(212) 277-6500
Attorney for Applicants